



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,297	11/20/2003	Timothy Gerrit Deboer	CA920020055US1	9784
<div>46073      7590      06/27/2007</div> <div>IBM CORPORATION (VE) C/O VOLEL EMILE P. O. BOX 162485 AUSTIN, TX 78716</div> <div>EXAMINER SIKRI, ANISH</div> <div>ART UNIT      PAPER NUMBER</div> <div>2143</div> <div>MAIL DATE      DELIVERY MODE</div> <div>06/27/2007      PAPER</div>				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/718,297

Applicant(s)

DEBOER ET AL.

Examiner

Anish Sikri

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/20/2003</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 2143

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Information Disclosure Statement**

The information disclosure statement submitted on 11/20/2003 been considered by the Examiner and made of record in the application file.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 6, 8, 10 objected to because of the following informalities: The spelling of the word analzing should be analyzing. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claims 1-5, 8-20, 23, 24, 27-34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Gish (US Pat 5,987,245).

Consider **Claim 1**, Gish clearly discloses a method of executing server side code in a client server environment comprising (Gish, Col 18, Lines 9-10): processing an input object identifying code for executing on a server (Gish, Col 19 Lines 13-19), said processing using a view list of at least one input object element (Gish, Col 27, Lines 66-67, Col 28, Lines 1-17 Lines 46-56), each input object element processing a type of code identified by the input object to output a deployable object (Gish, Col 28, Lines 46-63); processing the deployable object using a server list of at least one server element to determine a server for executing the code (Gish, Col 27, Lines 61-62) each server element enabling the deployable object to execute on a particular server and outputting

Art Unit: 2143

a launchable object (Gish, Col 27, Lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31); and processing the launchable object using a launcher list (Gish, Col 18, Lines 14-16) of at least one client element to determine a client for launching the code on the particular server (Gish, Col 27, Lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31). Gish's invention clearly shows on a client selects the components/objects based on a definition list maintained by the server(s) it communicates with. Once the client executes the selected application, a connection is created between the client and server, which facilitate the instances of client/server applications.

Consider **Claim 2**, Gish clearly discloses the method of claim 1 comprising launching the client determined in response to the launchable object and executing the code on the particular server (Gish, Col 27, Lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31). It clearly shows on how clients can have applications launched via the user interface.

Consider **Claim 3**, Gish clearly discloses the method of claim 1 wherein at least one of the view list (Gish, Col 28, Lines 20-24), server list (Gish, Col 18, Lines 14-16) and launcher list is extensible to accommodate additional respective elements (Gish, Col 28, Lines 21-26). It clearly shows on how the client can use the view list to see the elements, which can be launched from the servers, which contain the application code/programs.

Consider **Claim 4**, Gish clearly discloses the method of claim 1 comprising maintaining at least one of the view list (Gish, Col 28, Lines 20-24), server list (Gish, Col 18, Lines 14-16) and launcher list (Gish, Col 28, Lines 21-26). It clearly shows on how the client can use the maintained view list to see the elements, which can be launched from the servers, which contain the application code/programs.

Consider **Claim 5**, Gish clearly discloses the method of claim 4 wherein the step of maintaining comprises extending any of the view list (Gish, Col 28, Lines 20-24), server list (Gish, Col 18, Lines 14-16) and launcher list (Gish, Col 28, Lines 21-26). It clearly shows on how the client can use the maintained view list to see the elements, which can be launched from the servers, which contain the application code/programs.

Consider **Claim 8**, Gish discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the step of processing the deployable object comprises: analysing the deployable object to determine a server element for processing the deployable object (Gish Col 28 Lines 20-27); and processing the deployable object using the determined server element (Gish Col 28 Lines 20-27). It is clearly shown on how deployable objects/applications are processed and launched within the client-server model.

Consider **Claim 9**, Gish discloses the method of claim 8 including processing user input to determine the server element (Gish, Col 28 Lines 46-54). It clearly shows on how messages are sent to the server for processing from the input received the user/client.

Consider **Claim 10**, Gish discloses the step of processing the launchable object comprises: analysing the launchable object to determine a client element for processing the launchable object (Gish, Col 27, Lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31); and processing the launchable object using the determined client element (Gish, Col 27, Lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31). It clearly shows on how clients can have applications launched via the user interface.

Consider **Claim 11**, Gish discloses method of claim 10 including processing user input to determine the server element (Gish, Col 28 Lines 46-54). It clearly shows on how messages are sent to the server for processing from the user/client.

Consider **Claim 12**, Gish clearly discloses an extensible mechanism for executing server side code in a client server environment comprising (Gish, Col 18, Lines 9-10): a view mechanism for processing an input object identifying code for executing on a server (Gish, Col 19 Lines 13-19) and outputting a deployable object (Gish, Col 28, Lines 46-63); a server mechanism for processing the deployable object to determine a particular server for executing the code (Gish, Col 27, Lines 61-62) and to enable the deployable object to execute on the particular server, said second mechanism outputting a launchable object (Gish, Col 27, Lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31); and a launcher mechanism (Gish, Col 18, Lines 14-16) for processing the launchable object to determine a client for launching the code on the particular server (Gish, Col 27, Lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31). Gish's invention clearly shows an extensible mechanism in which a client selects the components/objects based on a definition list maintained by the server(s) it communicates with. Once the client

executes the selected application, a connection is created between the client and server, which facilitate the instances of client/server applications.

Consider **Claim 13**, Gish clearly discloses the extensible mechanism of claim 12 wherein said view mechanism comprises a view list of at least one input object element (Gish, Col 27, Lines 66-67, Col 28, Lines 1-17 Lines 46-56), each input object element processing a type of code identified by the input object for outputting the deployable object (Gish, Col 28, Lines 46-63). Gish's invention clearly shows on a how a client selects the components/objects, which are displayed on the view list.

Consider **Claim 14**, Gish clearly discloses the extensible mechanism of claim 13 wherein said view list (Gish, Col 28, Lines 20-24) is extensible to accommodate additional respective elements (Gish, Col 28, Lines 21-26). It clearly shows on how the client can use the view list to see the additional elements, which can be launched from the servers, which contain the application code/programs.

Consider **Claim 15**, Gish clearly discloses the extensible mechanism of claim 12 wherein said server mechanism comprises a server list of at least one server element (Gish, Col 27, Lines 61-62), each server element enabling the deployable object to execute on a particular server and processing the deployable object for outputting a launchable object (Gish, Col 27, Lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31). Gish's invention clearly shows an extensible mechanism in the client, who executes the selected application; a connection is created between the client and server where the application is located, which facilitate the instances of client/server applications.



Consider **Claim 16**, Gish clearly discloses the extensible mechanism of claim 15 wherein said server list (Gish, Col 18, Lines 14-16) is extensible to accommodate additional respective elements (Gish, Col 28, Lines 21-26). It clearly shows on how elements/programs/code can be added to the server lists. And these elements can be launched from the servers.

Consider **Claim 17**, Gish clearly discloses the extensible mechanism of claim 12 wherein said launcher mechanism comprises a launcher list (Gish, Col 28, Lines 21-26) of at least one client element (Gish, col 27, lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31), each client element enabling the launchable object to execute on a particular client for launching the code on the particular server (Gish, col 27, lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31). It clearly shows on how clients can have applications launched via the user interface.

Consider **Claim 18**, Gish clearly discloses the extensible mechanism of claim 17 wherein said launcher list is extensible to accommodate additional respective elements (Gish, Col 28, Lines 21-26). It clearly shows on how a launcher list can have elements/code/programs, which can be launched from the server.

Consider **Claim 19**, Gish clearly discloses the extensible mechanism of claim 12 wherein said extensible mechanism is adapted to launch the client determined in response to the launchable object for executing the code on the particular server (Gish, Col 27, Lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31). It clearly shows on how clients can have applications/objects launched from the use of user interface.

Consider **Claim 20**, Gish clearly discloses the extensible mechanism of claim 12 wherein at least one of said view mechanism (Gish, Col 28, Lines 20-24), server mechanism (Gish, Col 18, Lines 14-16), and launcher mechanism (Gish, Col 28, Lines 21-26) is extensible whereby said view mechanism is extensible to accommodate a plurality of code types (Gish, Col 28, Lines 21-26), said server mechanism is extensible to accommodate a plurality of servers and said launcher mechanism is extensible to accommodate a plurality of clients (Gish, Col 27, Lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31). Gish's invention clearly shows on a client selects the components/objects based on a definition list maintained by the server(s) it communicates with. Once the client executes the selected application, a connection is created between the client and server, which facilitate the instances of client/server applications.

Consider **Claim 23**, Gish clearly discloses the extensible mechanism of claim 12 wherein said server mechanism is adapted to analyze the deployable object to determine a server element for processing the deployable object (Gish, Col 27, lines 61-62); and process the deployable object using the determined server element (Gish, Col 27, lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31). Gish's invention clearly shows an extensible mechanism in which the deployable object is analyzed before it is launched from the request of the client.

Consider **Claim 24**, Gish clearly discloses the extensible mechanism of claim 23 wherein said server mechanism is further adapted for processing user input to determine the server element (Gish, Col 28 Lines 46-54). It clearly shows on how messages are sent to the server for processing from the user/client.

Consider **Claim 27**, Gish clearly shows the extensible mechanism of claim 12 wherein said extensible mechanism is adapted to be integrated into an integrated development environment (Gish, Col 25 Lines 12-25). It is clearly shown that the extensible mechanism is part of an application, which aids in development of client-server applications.

Consider **Claim 28**, Gish clearly shows a computer program product embodied in a computer readable medium for instructing a computer system to perform a method in accordance with claim 1 (Gish, Col 7, Lines 15-20, 32-39). It clearly shows that the computer program is embodied in a computer readable medium.

Consider **Claim 29**, Gish clearly discloses a computer readable media storing data and instructions readable by a computer system (Gish, Col 7, Lines 15-20, 32-39), said computer system executing an integrated development environment (IDE) for generating code for executing in a client server environment (Gish, Col 25 Lines 12-25), said data and instructions defining an extensible mechanism for executing said code on a server that, when deployed on said computer system, adapts said IDE (Gish, Col 25 Lines 12-25) to process an input object identifying code for executing on a server (Gish,

Col 19 Lines 13-19), said processing using a view list of at least one input object element (Gish, Col 27, Lines 66-67, Col 28 Lines 1-17, Lines 46-56), each input object element processing a type of code identified by the input object to output a deployable object (Gish, Col 28, Lines 46-63); process the deployable object using a server list of at least one server element to determine a server for executing the code (Gish, Col 27, Lines 61-62), each server element enabling the deployable object to execute on a particular server and outputting a launchable object (Gish, Col 27 Lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31); and process the launchable object using a launcher list (Gish, Col 18, Lines 14-16) of at least one client element to determine a client for launching the code on the particular server (Gish, Col 27, Lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31). Gish's invention clearly shows on a client selects the components/objects based on a definition list maintained by the server(s) it communicates with. Once the client executes the selected application, a connection is created between the client and server, which facilitate the instances of client/server applications.

Consider **Claim 30**, Gish clearly discloses the computer readable media of claim 29 wherein said IDE (Gish, Col 25 Lines 12-25) is further adapted by said data and instructions for modifying at least one of the view list (Gish, Col 28, Lines 20-24), server list (Gish, Col 18, Lines 14-16) and launcher list (Gish, Col 28, Lines 21-26). It clearly shows on how the client can use the view list to see the elements, which can be launched from the servers, which contain the application code/programs.

Consider **Claim 31**, Gish clearly discloses the computer readable media of claim 29 wherein said IDE (Gish, Col 25 Lines 12-25) is further adapted by said data and

Art Unit: 2143

instructions to launch the client determined in response to the launchable object to execute the code on the particular server (Gish, Col 27, Lines 51-55 Col 28 Lines 20-31). It clearly shows on how clients can have applications launched via the user interface.

Consider **Claim 32**, Gish clearly discloses a method of maintaining an extensible mechanism for executing server side code in a client server environment comprising: maintaining at least one of: a view list (Gish, Col 28, Lines 20-24) of at least one input object element (Gish, Col 27, Lines 66-67, Col 28, Lines 1-17 Lines 46-56), each input object element processing a type of code identified by the input object to output a deployable object (Gish, Col 27, Lines 46-63); a server list of at least one server element to determine a server for executing the code (Gish, Col 27, Lines 61-62), each server element enabling the deployable object to execute on a particular server and outputting a launchable object (Gish, Col 27, Lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31); and a launcher list (Gish, Col 18, Lines 14-16) of at least one client element to determine a client for launching the code on the particular server (Gish, Col 27, Lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31). Gish's invention clearly shows an extensible mechanism in which a client selects the components/objects based on a definition list maintained by the server(s) it communicates with. Once the client executes the selected application, a connection is created between the client and server, which facilitate the instances of client/server applications.

Consider **Claim 33**, Gish clearly discloses the method of claim 32 wherein the step of maintaining comprises at least one of: generating a respective element for (Gish,

Art Unit: 2143

Col 7, 51-53); adding a respective element to (Gish, Col 7, 51-53); configuring a respective element of (Gish, Col 7, 51-53); and deleting a respective element from (Gish, Col 7, 51-53), at least one of the view list (Gish, Col 28, Lines 20-24), server list (Gish, Col 18, Lines 14-16) and launcher list (Gish, Col 28, Lines 21-26). It clearly shows that elements can be added, launched, created, deleted or configured via the user interface.

Consider **Claim 34**, Gish clearly discloses the method of claim 32 comprising executing server side code using at least one of the view list (Gish, Col 28, Lines 20-24), server list (Gish, Col 18, Lines 14-16) and launcher list (Gish, Col 28, Lines 21-26). It clearly shows on how the client can use the lists to view the elements, which can be launched from the servers, which contain the application code/programs.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims **6, 7, 21, 22, 25, 26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gish (US Pat 5,987,245), in view of Nakajima (US Pat 6,363,433).

Consider **Claim 6**, Gish fails to disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the step of processing the input object comprises: analysing the input object to determine an input object element for processing the input object; and processing the input object using the determined input object element.

Nonetheless, Nakajima discloses the step of processing the input object comprises: analysing the input object to determine an input object element for processing the input object (Nakajima, Col 3 Lines 55-60); and processing the input object using the determined input object element (Nakajima, Col 3 Lines 55-66). It shows on how an input object element (code) is processed (formatted), and how the user via the use of an input device processes the input object elements. Therefore, it



Art Unit: 2143

would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use the processing input object element, taught by Nakajima in the method of Gish, for the purpose of analyzing and processing input elements captured/received by an input object.

Consider **Claim 7**, Gish in view of Nakajima clearly discloses the method of claim 6 including processing user input to determine the input object element (Gish, Col 28, Lines 1-17 Lines 46-56). It is clearly shown on how a user inputs an object element into the system, which gets processed.

Consider **Claim 21**, Gish fails to disclose the extensible mechanism of claim 12 wherein said view mechanism is adapted to analyze the input object to determine an input object element for processing the input object and process the input object using the determined input object element.

Nonetheless, Nakajima discloses the extensible mechanism wherein said view mechanism is adapted to analyze the input object to determine an input object element (Nakajima, Col 3 Lines 55-60) for processing the input object and process the input object using the determined input object element (Nakajima, Col 3 Lines 55-66). It shows on how an input object element (code) is processed (formatted), and how the user via the use of an input device processes the input object elements. Therefore, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use the processing input object element, taught by Nakajima in the method of

Gish, for the purpose of analyzing and processing input elements captured/received by an input object.

Consider **Claim 22**, Gish in view of Nakajima clearly discloses the extensible mechanism of claim 21 wherein said view mechanism is further adapted for processing user input to determine the input object element (Gish, Col 28, Lines 1-17, Lines 46-56). It is clearly shown on how a user inputs an object element into the system, which gets processed.

Consider **Claim 25**, Gish in view of Nakajima clearly discloses the extensible mechanism of claim 21 wherein said launcher mechanism is adapted to analyze the launchable object to determine a client element for processing the launchable object (Gish, Col 27, Lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31); and process the launchable object using the determined client element (Gish, Col 27, Lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31). It clearly shows on how clients can have applications launched via the user interface.

Consider **Claim 26**, Gish in view of Nakajima clearly discloses the extensible mechanism of claim 25 wherein said launcher mechanism (Gish, Col 18, Lines 14-16) is further adapted for processing user input to determine the server element (Gish, Col 27, lines 51-55, Col 28 Lines 20-31). It clearly shows on how messages are sent to the server for processing from the input received from the user/client.

### Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anish Sikri whose telephone number is 571-270-1783. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am - 5pm Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Anish Sikri (AS)

June 15, 2007

  
DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100